FILED DISTINCT COURT Third Judicial District

MAR 0 1 2013

SALT LAKE COUNTY

Deputy Clerk

BY SPECIAL APPEARANCE: Fred Brunsvik, Dave Poulson, David Adamson, David Bailey, Dennis Engle, 1059 E. Emerson Ave. Salt Lake City, Utah

IN THE "UTAH THIRD DISTRICT COURT" SALT LAKE DEPARTMENT

Fred Brunsvik, David Adamson, David Bailey, Dave Poulson, Dennis Engle; And Others --see an "Plaintiffs' List" to be Incorporated Herein By Reference

Plaintiffs,

Judith Atherton, Alicia Cook, Sim Gil, Blake Hills, Christine Durham, Matthew B. Durrant,

Defendants

QUI TAM COMPLAINT

NOTICE TO PRESERVE CASE, INCORPORATED INTO STATE CASE NUMBER AS ASSIGNED BELOW;

CLAIM OF IMMUNITY CONSTRUED SOLELY AS OF 1984 AND 1988

Case No. 130901479

Judge: Dever

COMES FORTH NOW THE ABOVE NAMED AND REFERENCED PLAINTIFFS,
PROSECUTING THIS CASE AS A "QUI TAM ACTION" FOR THE PEOPLE OF UTAH,
OR AS "QUI TAM ACTION PROSECUTORS," AND PROVIDES THE FOLLOWING
INFORMATION PERTAINING TO, AND FILES COMPLAINT AGAINST THE
FOLLOWING NAMED PERSONS, AS DEFENDANTS;

THIS ACTION CONSTITUTES A FUNDAMENTAL ORGANIC CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT AGAINST DEFENDANTS JUDITH ATHERTON, ALICIA COOK, SIM GIL, BLAKE HILLS, CHRISTINE DURHAM, AND MATTHEW B. DURRANT.



V.

- 1. THIS ACTION CONSTITUTES A FUNDAMENTAL CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT, NOT LIMITED TO THE ABOVE NAMED FIVE PLAINTIFFS, OR QUI TAM ACTION PROSECUTORS, BUT PRESERVED FOR THE ADDITION OF ALL OTHER PLAINTIFFS, OR QUI TAM ACTION PROSECUTORS, WHO SHALL COME FORTH UNDER THE UMBRELLA OF AN QUI TAM ACTION PROSECUTORS' "PLAINTIFFS' LIST" WHEN INCORPORATED INTO THIS CASE BY DIRECT REFERENCE TO THIS NUMBERED CASE PROVISION HEREIN, AGAINST DEFENDANTS JUDITH ATHERTON, ALICIA COOK, SIM GIL, BLAKE HILLS, CHRISTINE DURHAM, AND MATTHEW B. DURRANT FOR THEIR CONTINUED EXISTENCE OF UNLAWFUL ACTS OF APPEARING IN AN OFFICIAL CAPACITY UNDER THE LAWS EXISTENT OF THE ORGANIC "STATE OF UTAH," WHEN NO LAWFUL STATUTORY LAWS HAVE EXISTED FOR THE "STATE OF "UTAH" SINCE NOVEMBER 8, 1988 AND NO LAWFUL COURT HAS EXISTED TO TRY SUCH LAWS SINCE NOVEMBER 7, 1984.
- 2. COMES NOW, JOINTLY, AND BY SPECIAL APPEARANCE, THE PLAINTIFFS, IN THEIR ABOVE STATED CAPACITIES, AS QUI TAM ACTION PROSECUTORS, AND FILES THIS QUI TAM ACTION COMPLAINT AGAINST THE ABOVE NAMED DEFENDANT PARTIES, PURSUANT TO THE DISCOVERED EVIDENCE AND THE FINDINGS IN LAW AND FACT AS THEY EXIST AS FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS OF THE PLAINTIFFS, AND ALL OTHERS WHO SHALL HEREAFTER QUALIFY THEMSELVES AS PLAINTIFFS AS SHALL BE SET FORTH IN AN "PLAINTIFFS' LIST" AND INCORPORATED HEREIN BY REFERENCE HERETO, IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION, AS WITH THE UTAH CONSTITUTION TO SUCH EXTENT AS IT MAY BE POSSIBLE TO DO SO.
- 3. **COMMENCEMENT OF COMPLAINT**. THIS COMPLAINT GOES TO THE ASSOCIATED DATES OF <u>NOVEMBER 7, 1984</u> PERTAINING TO THE UTTER REPEAL AND INSTANT REENACTMENT OF <u>ARTICLE 8</u> OF THE UTAH CONSTITUTION, TO <u>NOVEMBER 8</u>,

1988 AS IT PERTAINS TO THE UTTER REPEAL OF <u>ARTICLE 19</u> OF THE "UTAH CONSTITUTION," AND CONTINUES THEREAFTER TO THE DATES OF <u>JULY 1, 1985</u>, AND TO <u>APRIL 20, 2012</u>.

- 4. ON <u>APRIL 20, 2012</u>, THE ABOVE TITLED COURT WAS CHARGED WITH <u>LACK OF STANDING</u>. THE LEGAL APPLICATION OF LACK OF STANDING IS "NO RIGHT TO SPEAK". "NO RIGHT TO BE HEARD." "NO RIGHT TO BE CONSIDERED."
- 5. AS A RESULT OF THE ABOVE STIPULATED-TO ACTS COMMITTED ON THE ABOVE DATES, OTHER UNLAWFULLY INVOLVED DATES AND ASSOCIATED ACTS ARE MAY 10, 2011, NOVEMBER 3, 2011, APRIL 20, 2012, AND NOVEMBER 12, 2012.
- 6. THE FOLLOWING CONSTITUTES A LAY-DOWN OF BASIC CHARGES AGAINST THE ABOVE NAMED DEFENDANTS, NOW BEING SUED BY <u>QUI TAM ACTION PROSECUTION</u>, FOR DAMAGES CAUSED TO THE UNSUSPECTING, DAMAGED PEOPLE OF UTAH, UNDER THE COMMON LAW, AS FOLLOWS:

I.

THE CHARGE AGAINST ATHERTON CONCERNING HER BEING CHARGED WITH "LACK OF STANDING," OR "NO RIGHT TO SPEAK" WAS NOT "CASE SPECIFIC."

II.

THE CHARGE AGAINST ALICIA COOK CONCERNING HER BEING CHARGED WITH "LACK OF STANDING," OR "NO RIGHT TO SPEAK" WAS NOT "CASE SPECIFIC."

THE CHARGE AGAINST COOK AND ATHERTON THAT THEY COULD NOT AGREE BETWEEN THEMSELVES, WHEN CHARGED WITH "LACK OF STANDING" ("NO RIGHT TO SPEAK"), THAT THEY COULD AGREE BETWEEN THEMSELVES THAT

THEY HAD STANDING, EVEN THOUGH THEY HAD "NO RIGHT TO SPEAK OR BE CONSIDERED" TO DO SO WAS NOT "CASE SPECIFIC."

THE CHARGE AGAINST BLAKE HILLS CONCERNING HIS BEING CHARGED WITH "LACK OF STANDING," OR "NO RIGHT TO SPEAK," AS EVINCED BY UT. CONSTITUTION'S ARTICLE 8, SECTION 16 – TAKEN IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE INSTANT 1984 "REENACTMENT" OF ARTICLE 8- LEGAL LOOP DILEMMA, WITHOUT RIGHT TO COVER FOR ALICIA COOK IN HER LACK OF STANDING, OR ANY OTHER ACT INVOLVING HER UNLAWFUL FLIGHT TO AVOID PROSECUTION OR WITNESSING, WAS NOT AND IS NOT "CASE SPECIFIC."

THE CHARGE AGAINST SIM GILL CONCERNING HIS BEING CHARGED WITH "LACK OF STANDING," OR "NO RIGHT TO SPEAK," IS NOT "CASE SPECIFIC."

THE CHARGE AGAINST CHRISTINE DURHAM CONCERNING HER BEING CHARGED WITH "LACK OF STANDING," OR "NO RIGHT TO SPEAK" WAS <u>NOT</u> AND IS NOT "CASE SPECIFIC."

THE CHARGE AGAINST CHRISTINE DURHAM FOLLOWING HER 61 + DAYS OF SILENCE FROM THE DATE SHE WAS SERVED IN THE 2011 FEDERAL CASE, # 2:11cv00674, IN WHICH SHE WAS CHARGED WITH "LACK OF STANDING," FURTHER CHARGES HER WITH LACK OF STANDING, AND ESTOPPEL BY LEACHES, IN THIS CURRENT CASE AGAINST HER, AND HER CONTINUED VIOLATION OF SUCH LACK OF RIGHT BY HER CLAIMED RIGHT TO TRANSFER HER UNLAWFUL AUTHORITY TO ANOTHER ON APRIL 1, 2012.

VII.

THE CHARGE AGAINST MATTHEW B. DURRANT CONCERNING HIS BEING CHARGED, HEREBY, WITH "LACK OF STANDING," OR "NO RIGHT TO SPEAK" AS OF <u>APRIL 1, 2012</u> AND THEREAFTER IS <u>NOT</u> "CASE SPECIFIC."

VIII.

INCORPORATION OF "THE UTAH EXHIBIT," ATTACHED HERETO, BY THIS REFERENCE IS TO BE ASSOCIATED WITH THE ABOVE COMPLAINED OF FUNDAMENTAL CHARGES BROUGHT BY THE PLAINTIFFS IN THIS CASE.

IX.

INCORPORATION OF "EXHIBIT 13" FILED ON <u>AUGUST 27, 2012</u> IN "UTAH" CASE # 111903498, BY THIS REFERENCE IS TO BE PRESERVED FOR THE RIGHTS OF THE PEOPLE OF THE LANDS AND STATE OF DESERET-UTAH, FORMERLY UTAH.

INCORPORATION OF THE 1896 AND 1984 EDITIONS OF THE "UTAH CONSTITUTION" AT ARTICLE I, SECTION 26' EXHIBITED EVIDENCE, ATTACHED HERETO, BY THIS REFERENCE HAS NEVER BEEN AND IS NOT CASE SPECIFIC.

XI.

INCORPORATION OF THE LACK OF THE WORD "LICENSE" IN THE UTAH CONSTITUTION'S 1896 ARTICLE 8 AND THE 1984 ARTICLE 8, DENYING THE USE OF THE WORD "LICENSE" AS IT PERTAINS TO ANY ATTORNEY, LAWYER, JUDGE, OR JUSTICE IN ANY YEAR FROM 1896 TO THE PRESENT DATE

XII

THE EXISTENCE OF ANY AND EVERY "ATTORNEY," "LAWYER," "JUDGE," OR "JUSTICE" IN ANY YEAR FROM 1896 TO THE PRESENT DATE IS REQUIRED TO BE VIEWED THROUGH THE ARTICLE I, SECTION 26, AND IS NOT TO BE REGARDED AS "CASE SPECIFIC."

XIII.

THE PUBLISHED CLAIM BY "MICHE ONLINE" THAT IT KNEW WHAT WAS IN THE MIND OF THE 1984 UTAH LEGISLATORS EXCEEDED ITS ABILITY TO STAND AND MAKE THAT CLAIM, OR THAT IT LACKED STANDING TO MAKE THAT CLAIM ("NO RIGHT TO LEGALLY SPEAK, NO RIGHT TO BE CONSIDERED"), AND ANY APPLICATION OF SUCH CLAIM BY ANY PERSON OR PARTY RELYING ON THE FALSITY THEREOF IS NOT "CASE SPECIFIC."

- 7. Because there is yet hard evidence surfacing as to the unlawful, and illegal acts committed, under color of law and authority, by certain of the above named defendants which is to be brought forth and filed into the case records in a timely manner, an exigent necessity exists that the current evidence as presented in the case be preserved until the plaintiffs, as Qui Tam Action Prosecutors, shall stipulate that no further evidence or witnesses are to be forthcoming, by which such rights to preserved evidence shall be tried under the auspices and aegis of the United States Constitution as the same shall be properly and truthfully defined, without exception, by which trial of the above named defendants shall be brought forth under lawful venue and jurisdiction accorded to the people of Utah for just cause thereafter as provided for by the U.S. Constitution and fundamental law.
- 8. The court, by its lawful makeup only, is thus informed of these things that it might understand the necessity of recognizing this case as being preserved, as is, for future purposes for the time and event when [the State of] Utah concurs that this case is proper in every aspect against all defendants, no matter who and what they may be, and accords plaintiffs their rights under the Constitution for the United States and the constitution for Utah so far as it may be applicable thereunder.
- 9. This Complaint may be amended within 20 days following the date of its being served on any defendant named herein.

- 10. THE EVIDENCE PRESERVED FOR THE UTAH EXHIBIT AS REFERRED TO ABOVE SHALL BE SUBMITTED INTO THIS CASE WITHIN THE NEXT <u>FIVE</u> DAYS IN ORDER THAT THIS CASE SHALL BE CONTINUED MINIMALLY THEREAFTER.
- 11. This lawsuit amount shall pertain to the five plaintiffs' costs divided between them of \$75. Only, and shall have no bearing on the damages to be won at trial of the defendants and paid to the damaged people of Utah, or else Deseret-Utah if that shall be determined the proper and lawful name for the nation-state itself, as this Qui Tam Action Complaint comes forward for their ultimate protection, which shall be determined only by way of trial by impartial jury, not trial with jury, being the unlawful practice thereof before the date of this lawful filing, accordingly.

Fred Brunsvik

Dave Poulson

David Bailey

David Adamson

Dennis Engle

Respectfully Submitted,

-\$^\$\text{\$\frac{1}{2}\text{\$\frac{1}\text{\$\frac{1}{2}\text{\$\frac{1}{2}\text{\$\frac{1}{2}\text{\$\frac{1}{2}\text{\$\frac{1}{2}\text{\$\frac{1}\text{\$\frac{1}\text{\$\frac{1}\text{\$\frac{1}\text{\$\frac{1}\text{\$\frac{1}\text{\$\fra

Cover Sheet for Civil Actions

Interpretation. If you do not speak or understand English, contact the court at least 3 days before the hearing or mediation, and an interpreter will be provided.	Interpretación. Si usted no habla o entiende el Inglés contacte al tribunal por lo menos 3 días antes de la audiencia o mediación y le proveerán un intérprete.				
Plaintiff/Petitioner (First) Fred Brunsvik	Defendant/Respondent (First)				
1059 Enerson Ane					
Address	Address				
City, State, Zip	City, State, Zip				
801-750-7556 fred @ or wed in with	ist mer				
Filone	Phone Email				
First Plaintiff/Petitioner's Attorney*	First Defendant/Respondent's Attorney*				
Name	Name				
Bar Number	Bar Number				
Plaintiff/Petitioner (Second)	Defendant/Respondent (Second)				
Name	Name				
Address	Address				
Çity, State, Zip	City, State, Zip				
Phone Email	Phone Email				
Second Plaintiff/Petitioner's Attorney*	Second Defendant/Respondent's Attorney*				
Name	Name				
Bar Number	Bar Number				
8	*Aftorney malling and email addresses provided by Utah State Bar.				
Total Claim for Damages \$ 759	Jury Demand Yes No \$250 ☐ Jury Demand				
Schedule of Fees: §78a-2-301 (Choose 🗵 all Ihal apply.	See Page 2 for fees for claims other than claims for damages.)				
PLEASE CHOOSE ONE BEFORE	\$180 Damages \$10,000 & over				
PROCEEDING:	— COMPLAINT OR INTERPLEADER — —				
Damages Unspecified (URCP 26: Tier 2)					
Damages requested are \$50,000 or less	(
(URCP 26: Tier 1)					
Damages requested are more than \$50,000	\$360 Damages \$10,000 & over				
and less than \$300,000 (URCP 26: Tier 2) Damages requested are \$300,000 or more	\$360 D Damages Unspecified				
(URCP 26: Tier 3) ☐ This case is exempt from URCP 26. (E)	 — COUNTERCLAIM, CROSS CLAIM, THIRD PARTY CLAIM, OR INTERVENTION — — \$55 □ Damages \$2000 or less 				
— MOTION TO RENEW JUDGMENT — —\$37.50 □ Damages \$2000 or less	\$150 Damages \$2001 - \$9999 \$155 D Damages \$10,000 & over				
\$92.50 Damages \$2001 - \$9,999					
Civil Cover Sheel Revised June 12, 2012 Page 1					

-		Choose 🗵 Only			gory
Fee		Case Type	Fee		Case Type
		APPEALS	\$100	_	Domestic Modification (72)
\$360 Sch	ם		\$100) [Counter-petition: Domestic Modification
		Court: Refer to Clerk of Court upon filing.	\$360		
\$225		V /V /// 1-/	\$360		
\$225			\$310		
8000		- — GENERAL CIVIL — — —	\$35		
\$360	90. 4	Attorney Discipline (T2)	\$35		Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction &
Sch	×	•	805		Enforcement Act (UCCJEA) (E)
\$0		5 (-)	\$35		The state of the s
\$360		Condemnation/Eminent Domain			(UIFSA) (E)
Sch '		Contract	_	- —	——— JUDGMENTS —————
Sch		Debt Collection	\$35		
Sch		Eviction/Forcible Entry and Detainer (E)	\$50		
\$360		Extraordinary Relief/Writs	,		Court/Agency (E)
\$360		Forfeiture of Property (E)	\$30		Abstract of Judgment/Order of Utah
Sch		Interpleader	\$35		State Tax Commission (E)
Sch		Lien/Mortgage Foreclosure	φου		3
Sch		Malpractice	\$ 360		Adoption/Foreign Adoption
Sch		Miscellaneous Civil	\$8	0	
Sch		Personal Injury	\$360		320 E 50 bot 101111
\$360	_	Post Conviction Relief: Capital (E)	\$360		Conservatorship (T2)
\$360		Post Conviction Relief: Non-capital (E)	\$360	_	Estate Personal Rep – Formal (72)
Sch		Property Damage .	\$35		11 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
Sch		Property Rights	\$360		Foreign Probate/Child Custody Doc. (E)
Sch		Sexual Harassment	\$360		Gestational Agreement (72)
	_	3	\$0		Guardianship (72)
Sch		Wrongful Death	\$360		Involuntary Commitment (72)
\$360		Wrongful Lien	\$360		Minor's Settlement (72)
Sch		Wrongful Termination	\$360		Name Change (72)
	_	— — — DOMESTIC — — — —	\$360		Supervised Administration (72)
-		Cohabitant Abuse (E)	\$360		Trusts (T2)
\$310 .	П	Marriage Adjudication (Common Law)			Unspecified (Other) Probate (72)
\$310		Custody/Visitation/ Support (T2)	\$35		- SPECIAL MATTERS
\$310		Divorce/Annulment (T2)	\$35 \$0		Arbitration Award (E)
		☐ Check if child support, custody or parent-	\$135		Determination Competency-Criminal (E)
		time will be part of decree Check if Temporary Separation filed			Expungement (E)
\$8		Vital Statistics §26-2-25 per form	\$0 525		Hospital Lien (E)
		Counterclaim: Divorce/Sep Maint.	\$35		Judicial Approval of Document: Not Part of Pending Case (E)
		Counterclaim: Custody/Visitation/	\$35		Notice of Deposition in Out-of-State
		Support			Case/Foreign Subpoena (E)
155 [)	Counterclaim: Paternity/Grandparent	\$35		Open Sealed Record (E)
	'	Visitation	(E) Exemp (T2) Case	l fron lype	n URCP Rule 26 defaulls to Tier 2 (no monelary damages)

ď.